

REMARKS

This amendment is in further response to the Office Action of July 10, 2003, and to supplement applicant's prior amendment dated September 25, 2003.

Applicant requests a one-month extension of time. The appropriate fee is enclosed.

Reinstatement of Original Claims, with Minor Amendments

Please disregard all amendments made to the claims in applicant's prior amendment of September 25, 2003, and please reinstate all of the original claims in this application, as amended herein with minor amendments. In addition, please cancel the new claims 19-22 that were added in the prior amendment.

The purpose of this change is that the prior amendments were made in error. Thus, reinstatement of the original claims is requested, with minor amendments herein. For example, "capacity" should be "capacitor." In addition, applicant is presenting new claims in a divisional application being filed herewith under separate cover.

Applicant also wishes to continue prosecution of the original claims in the present case. In that regard, applicant hereby repeats the arguments made in the prior amendment of September 25, 2003. Specifically, applicant submits that claims 1-3, 17 and 18 are not obvious over the art cited by the Examiner, for the reasons discussed in the amendment of September 25, 2003.

Request for Reconsideration of Withdrawal

Applicant also again requests the Examiner to reconsider her withdrawal of claims 6-16 pursuant to the final election requirement made in the Office Action of July 10, 2003. Specifically, applicant submits that the elected species in the present case involve the subject matter of claims 1-8, 11, 12-15 and 17 and 18, for the reasons discussed in the amendment of September 25, 2003. Further, it is pointed out that the European Patent Office examiner in the International Preliminary Examination Report, dated 02.01.2002 (copy enclosed), for the priority PCT application previously indicated that claims 1-8, 11, 17 and 18 are all drawn to the same invention. See the Separate Sheet in that Report

discussing "Item IV, Lack of Unity of Invention" (relevant portion attached hereto and highlighted).


Conclusion

In conclusion, all of the claims are now believed to be allowable. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

If there are still unresolved issues requiring adverse action, it is requested that the Examiner contact applicant's attorney so that appropriate arrangements can be made for discussing and perhaps resolving the same.

Respectfully submitted,

MUSERLIAN, LUCAS AND MERCANTI, LLP

By: 

Otho B. Ross
Reg. No. 32,754
Attorneys for Applicant
475 Park Avenue South
New York, NY 10016
Tel. 212-661-8000
Fax 212-661-8002

Dated: November 4, 2003